Amendment Transmittal Letter

Docket Number

WSP242US

FEB 0 6 2009

Address To Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450									
Title of Invention									
COSMETIC COMPOSI	TION PROMOTING	G OXYGEN TRANSPORT I	NTO THE SK	IN					
First Named Inventor	Gabriele Blume								
Application No.	10/567,631								
Filing Date	February 08, 2006								
Examiner	Jennifer Ann Berrios								
Art Unit	4121								
Transmitted herewith is an amendment in the above-identified application. The fee has been calculated and is transmitted as shown below. X Applicant claims Small Entity Status. See 37 CFR 1.27.									
Fee Calculation									
Claims as Amended									
For	#Filed	#Previously Paid For	#Extra	Rate	Fee				
Total Claims	24	- 24 =		x 26 =					
Total indep. Claims	Total Indep. Claims 1 - 3 = x 110 = Multiple Dependent Claims (check if applicable)								
TOTAL \$0									
	Method of Payment								
X Deposit Account									
Deposit Account Num	ber 50-0822								
Charge the fee(s) Charge any additi Charge fee(s) indi Credit any overpa WARNING: Informa	set forth above fonal fee(s) or under icated above, exceptyments ation on this forr	n may become public. (7 CFR 1.16 ar Credit card i	nd 1.17	should not be included				
on this form. Provi	ide credit card in	formation and authoriz							
•			Amou	nt Grand Total					

Amendment Transmittal Letter

Docket Number

WSP242US

Correspondence Address										
Customer Number 49003										
L		-OR-				**				
Name										
Address										
City		State								
Country		Postal Cod	е							
Phone Number										
E-mail Address										
Certificate of Mailing by Express Mail I hereby certify that this Amendment, accompanying documents, and fee (if appropriate) are being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR 1.10 in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on the date indicated below: (Date of Mailing) (Typed or Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence) (Signature of Person Mailing Correspondence)		Certificate of Mailing by First Class Mail I hereby certify that this Amendment, accompanying documents, and fee (if appropriate) are being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on the date indicated below: February 4, 2009 Michael L. Dunn (Date of Mailing) (Signature of Person Mailing Correspondence) Certificate of Transmission I hereby certify that this Amendment, accompanying documents, and fee (if appropriate) authorization are being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the date indicated below: (Date of Transmission) (Name of Person Transmitting Correspondence) (Signature of Person Transmitting Correspondence)								
Select the name of the person who will electronically sign the Amendment from the drop-down box below. If a practitioner is not present in the drop-down list, you must close this form and select 'Add Practitioner' in the Form Manager's Utility menu. Verify that the signatory information is correct and press the 'eSign' button to electronically sign the submission. If you prefer to sign the form manually, simply do not click the 'eSign' button; just print and manually sign.										
Signatory Drop-Down Box Dunn, Michael L.										
Name	Michael L. Dunn	<u> </u>		Registration Nu	mber	25,330				
Signatory Capacit	y Attorney for Applicant(s)	E-ma	il Address							
eSign	Muly (.)	$\overline{)}$			Date Signed	2-4-091				



Application No.10/567,631 Nationalization of PCT/EP2004/051702 Attorney Docket No. WSP242US Response to Restriction Requirement dated January 5, 2009

Date: February 4, 2009

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the Matter of United States Patent Application:

Applicant(s):

Gabriel Blume et al.

Examiner:

Jennifer Ann Berrios

Application No.:

10/567,631

Art Unit:

4121

Filed:

February 8, 2006

For:

COSMETIC COMPOSITION

PROMOTING OXYGEN

TRANSPORT INTO THE SKIN

Confirmation Number: 1303

Certificate of Mailing by First Class Mail

I certify that this Response to Restriction Requirement is being deposited on February 4, 2009 with sufficient postage with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail under 37 C.F.R. §1.8 and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents,

PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1430.

Michael L. Dunn Reg. No. 25330

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Honorable Sir:

This is in reply to the official action of January 5, 2009 requiring an election between four species.

At the outset the requirement seems confusing by mixing U.S. and PCT practice.

All that is needed in PCT Practice is unity of invention.

37 CFR 1.475 says:

"(a) An international and a national stage application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept ("requirement of unity of invention"). Where a group of inventions is claimed in an application, the requirement of unity of invention shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features. The

Application No.10/567,631 Nationalization of PCT/EP2004/051702 Attorney Docket No. WSP242US Response to Restriction Requirement dated January 5, 2009 Date: February 4, 2009

expression "special technical features" shall mean those technical features that define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art."

All claims of the present invention has the special technical feature of "A cosmetic composition to assist oxygen transport into the skin with vesicles as carriers, wherein the composition comprises ...lipid ... and ...a fluorocarbon or mixture of fluorocarbons charged with oxygen."

The Examiner is referred to MPEP 1850 I.

"....In applying PCT Rule 13.2 to international applications as an International Searching Authority, an International Preliminary Examining Authority and to national stage applications under 35 U.S.C. 371, examiners should consider for unity of invention all the claims to different categories of invention in the application and permit retention in the same application for searching and/or preliminary examination, claims to the categories which meet the requirements of PCT Rule 13.2....

The categories of invention in former PCT Rule 13.2 have been replaced with a statement describing the method for determining whether the requirement of unity of invention is satisfied. Unity of invention exists only when there is a technical relationship among the claimed inventions involving one or more special technical features. The term "special technical features" is defined as meaning those technical features that define a contribution which each of the inventions considered as a whole, makes over the prior art. The determination is made based on the contents of the claims as interpreted in light of the description and drawings. Chapter 10 of the International Search and Preliminary Examination Guidelines also contains examples concerning unity of invention...."

The Examiner is also referred to MPEP 1850 II:

"....From the preceding paragraphs it is clear that the decision with respect to unity of invention rests with the International Searching Authority or the International Preliminary Examining Authority. However, the International Searching Authority or the International Preliminary Examining Authority should not raise objection of lack of unity of invention merely because the inventions claimed are classified in separate classification groups or merely for the purpose of restricting the international search to certain classification groups.... If the independent claims avoid the prior art and satisfy the requirement of unity of invention, no problem of lack of unity arises in respect of any claims that depend on the independent claims. In particular, it does not matter if a dependent claim itself contains a further invention...."

Application No.10/567,631

Nationalization of PCT/EP2004/051702

Attorney Docket No. WSP242US

Response to Restriction Requirement dated January 5, 2009

Date: February 4, 2009

Election of species is a U.S. practice and has no place in PCT practice as applied to the present application where, as here, there is no reasonable basis for application of prior art to generic claims.

The Examiner has cited U.S. Patents 6,022,561; 3,645,390; and 3,890,333. None of these patents, alone or together, address the "special technical features" of the present claims under either 35 U.S.C. 102 or 35 U.S.C. 103.

The references cited by the Examiner merely individually address different possible components of the presently claimed cosmetic composition and none of the cited patents even mention "fluorinated hydrocarbon" for any purpose and certainly do not disclose or suggest "fluorinated hydrocarbon" in such a composition, which is at the heart of the oxygen carrying portion of the presently claimed cosmetic composition to assist oxygen transport into the skin.

The present claims are clearly united by a special technical feature and have "unity of invention" under PCT Rules.

The claims may thus not be restricted from each other.

Group 1) directed to claims 13-36 is elected with traverse. Claim 13 is the only independent claim and includes "lipid conjugate", referred to by the Examiner as "specific lipid conjugate", even thought he word "specific" does not appear in the claims. All other claims are directly or indirectly dependent upon claim 1 and thus all also contain "lipid conjugate" (Species 1).

The mere addition of additional components, i.e. "lipid conjugate solvent", "nicotinic compound" and/or "alcohol", in subclaims, does not remove "lipid conjugate" from the claims in which additional components are added.

3

Application No.10/567,631 Nationalization of PCT/EP2004/051702 Attorney Docket No. WSP242US Response to Restriction Requirement dated January 5, 2009

Date: February 4, 2009

The restriction should therefore be withdrawn for two major reasons, i.e. a) there is unity of invention and b) even if there weren't unity of invention, all claims read on species (1).

Dated: February 4, 2009

MLD/mjk

Respectfully submitted,

Michael L. Dunn

Registration No. 25330 CUSTOMER NO. 49003

Simpson & Simpson, PLLC

5555 Main Street

Williamsville, NY 14221-5406

Telephone No. 716-626-1564